

Between entropy and subentropy

Sarah R. Nichols and William K. Wootters

Department of Physics, Williams College, Williamstown, MA 01267, USA

Abstract

The von Neumann entropy and the subentropy of a mixed quantum state are upper and lower bounds, respectively, on the accessible information of any ensemble consistent with the given mixed state. Here we define and investigate a set of quantities intermediate between entropy and subentropy.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 89.70.+c, 65.40.Gr

1 Entropy and subentropy

The von Neumann entropy of a quantum state ρ can be defined as

$$S(\rho) = -\text{tr } \rho \ln \rho = -\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \ln \lambda_j, \quad (1)$$

where n is the dimension of ρ , the λ 's are its eigenvalues, and the expression $x \ln x$, when evaluated at $x = 0$, is taken to have the value $\lim_{x \rightarrow 0} x \ln x = 0$. The von Neumann entropy is of central importance in physics; when applied to a thermal ensemble, it is *the* entropy of thermodynamics. In quantum information theory it plays prominent roles in many contexts, *e.g.*, in studies of the classical capacity of a quantum channel [1, 2] and the compressibility of a quantum source [3, 4]. To introduce the problem that we will be considering here, we focus on the role that the von Neumann entropy plays in Holevo's theorem [5, 6, 7, 8]. Part of the content of this theorem can be stated as follows. Suppose we are handed a quantum object and are told that it is in one of several possible pure states $|\psi_i\rangle$, $i = 1, \dots, N$, the probability of the state $|\psi_i\rangle$ being p_i . By measuring this single object, we aim to get as much information as possible about the identity of the state, that is, the value of the index i . The maximum amount we can obtain is called the *accessible information* of the ensemble consisting of the ordered pairs $(|\psi_i\rangle, p_i)$. In general there is no analytic formula for the accessible information, but Holevo's theorem gives us a simple and general upper bound: the accessible information is no greater than the von Neumann entropy of the ensemble's density matrix

$$\rho = \sum_{i=1}^N p_i |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|. \quad (2)$$

Moreover, the von Neumann entropy—we will usually refer to it simply as the entropy—is the *least* upper bound on the accessible information that depends only on the density matrix ρ and not on other details of the ensemble. To see why this is true, note that the ensemble consisting of the eigenstates of ρ , with the eigenvalues as weights, is an ensemble realizing the density matrix ρ and from which one can extract, in a single measurement, an amount of information equal to $S(\rho)$. That is, the upper bound can be achieved.

It is natural also to ask about the analogous *lower* bound: what is the greatest lower bound on the accessible information of an ensemble that de-

depends only on the ensemble's density matrix? This question has been answered [9]: the greatest lower bound is the *subentropy* $Q(\rho)$, defined by

$$Q(\rho) = - \sum_{j=1}^n \left(\prod_{k \neq j} \frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_k} \right) \lambda_j \ln \lambda_j. \quad (3)$$

(If two or more of the eigenvalues λ_j are equal, the value of Q is determined unambiguously by taking a limit starting with unequal eigenvalues.) Just as the ensemble of eigenstates of ρ has an accessible information that matches the upper bound $S(\rho)$, there is a complementary ensemble, called the Scrooge ensemble [9], that likewise realizes ρ but has an accessible information equal to the lower bound $Q(\rho)$.

Thus in this context of acquiring information from a single quantum system, the von Neumann entropy and its lesser known analog the subentropy play mirror-image roles and together define the range of possible values of the accessible information for a given density matrix.

Comparing Eqs. (1) and (3) one sees a certain formal similarity between S and Q . The similarity is more striking if we rewrite both S and Q as contour integrals [9]. One can write

$$S(\rho) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint (\ln z) \operatorname{tr} (I - \rho/z)^{-1} dz, \quad (4)$$

where the contour encloses all the nonzero eigenvalues of ρ . To make the connection between Eq. (4) and Eq. (1) note that the eigenvalues of $(I - \rho/z)^{-1}$ are $z/(z - \lambda_j)$, so that each term in the trace contributes a residue that becomes a term in Eq. (1). Similarly, one can express Q as

$$Q(\rho) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint (\ln z) \det (I - \rho/z)^{-1} dz. \quad (5)$$

Thus, where the trace appears in the formula for entropy, the determinant appears in the formula for subentropy.

The formulas given in Eqs. (4) and (5) raise an interesting mathematical issue which is the impetus for this paper. The trace and the determinant of a matrix are simply the first and last of the coefficients in the characteristic polynomial of the matrix. In place of the trace in Eq. (4) or the determinant in Eq. (5), one could insert any of the other coefficients of this polynomial

and thereby identify new functions that might be regarded as natural generalizations of entropy and subentropy. In what follows we define a set of functions of ρ based on this mathematical substitution and investigate their properties. We call the functions $R_r^{(n)}$, $r = 1, \dots, n$, with $R_1^{(n)}$ being equal to S and $R_n^{(n)}$ being equal to Q . Among the properties we will discover is the string of inequalities $Q = R_n^{(n)} \leq R_{n-1}^{(n)} \leq \dots \leq R_1^{(n)} = S$, valid for any density matrix ρ .

In some respects, the subentropy Q is quite unlike the entropy S . For example, Q is not additive: if $\rho = \rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$, then $Q(\rho)$ is typically not the same as $Q(\rho_1) + Q(\rho_2)$, whereas the entropy is always additive in this sense. However, Q does share with S the following property. Suppose we augment the state space and the density matrix ρ by including m extra dimensions with zero weight. That is, we replace ρ with $\rho \oplus 0_m$, where 0_m is the $m \times m$ zero matrix, in effect adding to the set of eigenvalues $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ m additional eigenvalues all equal to zero. One can see immediately from Eqs. (1) and (3) that both S and Q remain invariant under this augmentation of the space. Since we are looking for natural generalizations of S and Q , it is interesting to ask whether our new quantities $R_r^{(n)}$ also have this property.

We will find, in fact, that they do not. But we will be able to construct simple convex combinations of the $R_r^{(n)}$'s that do remain invariant under the addition of “null” dimensions. These particular linear combinations, called $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$, are parameterized by the single continuous parameter α and interpolate between S and Q .

We are thus investigating in this paper various functions that generalize von Neumann entropy and subentropy in a specific mathematical sense. There is no guarantee, of course, that these functions will be of value for physics. At the end of the paper we offer a speculative potential interpretation of $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$ in quantum information theory but otherwise leave this question for future investigation.

2 Definition of $R_r^{(n)}$

Given any $n \times n$ complex matrix M , the characteristic polynomial of M is the quantity $\det(\mu I - M)$ regarded as a function of μ . If we write this polynomial

as

$$\det(\mu I - M) = \mu^n + \sum_{r=1}^n (-1)^r C_r(M) \mu^{n-r}, \quad (6)$$

then the coefficient $C_r(M)$ is given by

$$C_r(M) = \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_r} \left(\prod_{s=1}^r \nu_{k_s} \right), \quad (7)$$

the ν 's being the eigenvalues of M . Thus the index r indicates the number of eigenvalues being multiplied together in each term.¹ The coefficient $C_1(M)$ is the trace of M , and $C_n(M)$ is the determinant.

By analogy with Eqs. (4) and (5), we now define a set of quantities $R_r^{(n)}$ as follows:

$$R_r^{(n)}(\rho) = - \left(\binom{n-1}{r-1} \right)^{-1} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \oint (\ln z) C_r[(I - \rho/z)^{-1}] dz, \quad (8)$$

where again the contour is chosen to enclose all the nonzero eigenvalues of ρ , and $\left(\binom{n-1}{r-1} \right)$ is the binomial coefficient $\frac{(n-1)!}{(r-1)!(n-r)!}$. We have included this factor because, as we will see in the following sections, it places the functions $R_r^{(n)}$ between S and Q . Note that, as promised, $R_r^{(n)}(\rho)$ is equal to $S(\rho)$ for $r = 1$ and to $Q(\rho)$ for $r = n$.

It is straightforward to evaluate the integral in Eq. (8) so as to write $R_r^{(n)}$ explicitly as a function of the eigenvalues of ρ . One finds that

$$R_r^{(n)} = - \left(\binom{n-1}{r-1} \right)^{-1} \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_r} \sum_{s=1}^r \left[\prod_{t \neq s}^r \left(\frac{\lambda_{k_s}}{\lambda_{k_s} - \lambda_{k_t}} \right) \right] \lambda_{k_s} \ln \lambda_{k_s}. \quad (9)$$

For $r = 2, \dots, n$, we can rearrange the indices to get an expression more analogous to Eq. (3):

$$R_r^{(n)} = - \sum_{j=1}^n \left\{ \left(\binom{n-1}{r-1} \right)^{-1} \sum_{\substack{k_1 < \dots < k_{r-1} \\ \text{each } k_s \neq j}} \left[\prod_{s=1}^{r-1} \left(\frac{\lambda_j}{\lambda_j - \lambda_{k_s}} \right) \right] \right\} \lambda_j \ln \lambda_j. \quad (10)$$

¹We adopt the convention that there are always exactly n eigenvalues of an $n \times n$ matrix: if a root $\mu = \nu$ of the equation $\det(\mu I - M) = 0$ has multiplicity m , we say that m of the n eigenvalues of M have the value ν .

Notice that the number of terms in the sum over $k_1, \dots, k_{r-1}$ is $\binom{n-1}{r-1}$, because there are $n-1$ index-values from which to choose, the value j being disallowed. Thus the quantity in curly brackets is an *average* of the kind of product that appears in the expression (3) for Q .

As in the case of Q , in order to evaluate Eq. (10) when two or more of the eigenvalues λ_j are equal, we have to take a limit. That the limit is unique is guaranteed by Eq. (8) which has a unique value for all density matrices ρ .

Though we have already written the functions $R_r^{(n)}$ in a few ways, it will be helpful to re-express these functions in quite different terms in order to derive certain properties. This re-expression is the goal of the following section.

3 Another path to $R_r^{(n)}$

Let us return to the problem of ascertaining the quantum state of a single quantum system, given the ensemble $\{(|\psi_i\rangle, p_i)\}$. In addition to being a lower bound on the amount of information one can gain when one makes the *best* possible measurement, the subentropy $Q(\rho)$ is also the *average* information one obtains about the state, where the average is over all complete orthogonal measurements. (Indeed, the latter fact is sufficient to prove that Q is a lower bound on the accessible information.) Interpreting Q as this average leads to another way of expressing Q mathematically [9].

$$Q(\rho) = -n \int \left(\sum_i \lambda_i x_i \right) \ln \left(\sum_i \lambda_i x_i \right) dx + n \int x_1 \ln x_1 dx. \quad (11)$$

Here the x_i 's are non-negative real numbers constrained to sum to unity; that is, the ordered set $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ represents a point in the probability space, or probability simplex, appropriate for a set of n possibilities. The integrals in Eq. (11) are integrals over this probability space, the measure being the uniform measure normalized to unity. Explicitly, for any function $g(x)$,

$$\int g(x) dx \equiv \frac{1}{(n-1)!} \int_0^1 \int_0^{1-x_1} \cdots \int_0^{1-x_1-\cdots-x_{n-2}} g(x) dx_{n-1} \cdots dx_2 dx_1. \quad (12)$$

In Eq. (11) there is no special significance to the index 1 that appears in the second integral. Because of the symmetry of the measure, any other of the

x_i 's could equally well have been chosen. In fact, we can write the integral more symmetrically as follows.

$$Q(\rho) = n \int f(x) dx, \quad (13)$$

where

$$f(x) = -\left(\sum_i \lambda_i x_i\right) \ln \left(\sum_i \lambda_i x_i\right) + \sum_i \lambda_i x_i \ln x_i. \quad (14)$$

Interestingly, the entropy $S(\rho) = R_1^{(n)}(\rho)$ can be written in an analogous form. We simply need to replace the integral $\int f(\cdot) dx$ in Eq. (13) with a discrete sum over the extreme points of the probability simplex. That is, instead of integrating over all points $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, we sum over the special points $x^{(1)} = (1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $x^{(2)} = (0, 1, 0, \dots, 0)$, $\dots$, $x^{(n)} = (0, \dots, 0, 1)$. Again, we take the total weight of all these points to be unity. Thus, starting with Eq. (13) we perform the modification

$$\int f(x) dx \rightarrow \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n f(x^{(j)}), \quad (15)$$

which brings us to

$$n \left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \sum_{j=1}^n f(x^{(j)}) = -\sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j \ln \lambda_j = S(\rho). \quad (16)$$

It turns out that the quantities $R_r^{(n)}$ for other values of r can likewise be expressed as in Eq. (13) but with different ranges of integration. We have just seen that $R_1^{(n)}$, which is the entropy itself, can be expressed in this way if the “integral” is taken to be over the discrete set of extreme points of the simplex. As we will show shortly, $R_2^{(n)}$ is similarly given by Eq. (13), but with the integral being taken over the *edges* of the simplex, that is, over those points x having at most two nonzero components. (Again the measure is uniform in the Euclidean sense and normalized to unity.) And in general, $R_r^{(n)}$ is given by the same expression, but with the integral being over all points x having at most r nonzero components.

To prove this claim, let us set up the integral $I_r^{(n)}$ that we have just described:

$$I_r^{(n)} = \binom{n}{r}^{-1} n \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_r} \int_{k_1, \dots, k_r} f(x) dx. \quad (17)$$

Here $\int_{k_1, \dots, k_r} (\cdot \cdot \cdot) dx$ is the integral over the “face” of the simplex in which only $x_{k_1}, \dots, x_{k_r}$ are nonzero, with the measure normalized to unity. There are $\binom{n}{r}$ terms in the sum, so we have divided by $\binom{n}{r}$ to ensure that the measure of the entire region over which we are integrating—that is, the collection of all the relevant faces—is normalized to unity. We wish to show that $I_r^{(n)} = R_r^{(n)}$.

Consider first the integral over just one face,

$$\int_{k_1, \dots, k_r} f(x) dx. \quad (18)$$

We can regard this integral as being over a complete probability space, but with only r possibilities instead of n . Therefore, if we multiply it by r , we see from Eq. (13) that we get something formally similar to Q —not the Q of the original density matrix ρ but rather of an effective r -dimensional density matrix whose (unnormalized) eigenvalues are $\lambda_{k_1}, \dots, \lambda_{k_r}$. (The equivalence between Eq. (13) and Eq. (3) does not depend on the λ ’s adding up to unity [9].) That is, from Eq. (3) we have

$$\int_{k_1, \dots, k_r} f(x) dx = -\left(\frac{1}{r}\right) \sum_{s=1}^r \left[\prod_{t \neq s}^r \left(\frac{\lambda_{k_s}}{\lambda_{k_s} - \lambda_{k_t}} \right) \right] \lambda_{k_s} \ln \lambda_{k_s}. \quad (19)$$

Inserting this expression into Eq. (17), we get

$$I_r^{(n)} = -\binom{n-1}{r-1}^{-1} \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_r} \sum_{s=1}^r \left[\prod_{t \neq s}^r \left(\frac{\lambda_{k_s}}{\lambda_{k_s} - \lambda_{k_t}} \right) \right] \lambda_{k_s} \ln \lambda_{k_s}, \quad (20)$$

which according to Eq. (9) is equal to $R_r^{(n)}$. We have, therefore,

$$R_r^{(n)} = I_r^{(n)} = \binom{n}{r}^{-1} n \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_r} \int_{k_1, \dots, k_r} f(x) dx, \quad (21)$$

as claimed.

We can thus write all the quantities $R_r^{(n)}$ as normalized integrals of the same integrand, but with different ranges of integration.

4 Ordering the R 's

In this section we use the form just derived to prove the string of inequalities mentioned in the introduction:

$$Q(\rho) = R_n^{(n)}(\rho) \leq R_{n-1}^{(n)}(\rho) \leq \cdots \leq R_1^{(n)}(\rho) = S(\rho), \quad (22)$$

which hold for every $n \times n$ density matrix ρ . We will show, in fact, that all the inequalities are *strict* except when ρ is pure, in which case $R_r^{(n)} = 0$ for every r . Since each function $R_r^{(n)}$ depends only on the eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$, which are non-negative and sum to unity, we can alternatively think of $R_r^{(n)}$ as a function on the probability space for a set of n possibilities. If we picture each of these functions as a “surface” plotted over the probability space, our inequalities tell us that the surfaces corresponding to different values of r do not cross each other and coincide only at the extreme points of the simplex.

To prove the (non-strict) inequalities (22), we first prove that the function f defined in Eq. (14) is a convex function of x for every set of allowed values of the λ 's. We do this by extending the definition (14) to all non-negative values of the x_i 's—that is, we allow x to be unnormalized—and showing that f is convex even in this larger set. Treating the x_i 's as independent variables—and for the moment restricting our attention to the case where they are all strictly positive—let us compute the matrix of second derivatives of f :

$$M_{ij} \equiv \left(\sum_k \lambda_k x_k \right) \frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j} = \delta_{ij} \frac{\lambda_i}{x_i} \left(\sum_k \lambda_k x_k \right) - \lambda_i \lambda_j. \quad (23)$$

We show that the matrix M is non-negative definite by considering its expectation value with respect to an arbitrary real vector v . Using Dirac notation, we have

$$\langle v | M | v \rangle = \left(\sum_i \frac{v_i^2 \lambda_i}{x_i} \right) \left(\sum_k \lambda_k x_k \right) - \left(\sum_i v_i \lambda_i \right)^2. \quad (24)$$

But if we define new vectors w and z by $w_i = v_i \sqrt{\lambda_i / x_i}$ and $z_i = \sqrt{\lambda_i x_i}$, then we can write this equation as

$$\langle v | M | v \rangle = \langle w | w \rangle \langle z | z \rangle - \langle w | z \rangle^2, \quad (25)$$

whose right-hand side is non-negative by the Schwartz inequality. Because M is related to $\partial^2 f / \partial x_i \partial x_j$ by a positive factor, it follows that f is a convex

function of x , at least when each x_i is greater than zero. But by continuity, the convexity extends to those points where some of the components x_i are zero.

We will also need *strict* convexity in certain cases, and for this we need to take into account the possibility that some of the λ 's might be zero. Suppose that $\lambda_{k_1}, \dots, \lambda_{k_s}$ are nonzero and that all the other λ 's are zero. Notice that in that case the right-hand side of Eq. (25) is zero only when the components $(v_{k_1}, \dots, v_{k_s})$ of v are proportional to the corresponding components $(x_{k_1}, \dots, x_{k_s})$ of x . But v defines the direction along which we are taking the second derivative of f . Therefore if we consider a line containing two values of $(x_{k_1}, \dots, x_{k_s})$ that are *not* proportional to each other, the second derivative of f along this line is *strictly* positive, so that f is strictly convex along this line. (The second derivative might approach infinity as some components x_i approach zero, but this pathology does not ruin the convexity.) We will need this fact shortly.

We now use the convexity of f to prove the inequalities (22), beginning with the first one: $R_n^{(n)} \leq R_{n-1}^{(n)}$. Consider any point $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ in the probability simplex that is not one of the extreme points. We can write x as

$$\begin{aligned} (x_1, \dots, x_n) = \frac{1}{n-1} \big\{ & (1-x_1)[(0, x_2, \dots, x_n)/(1-x_1)] \\ & + (1-x_2)[(x_1, 0, x_3, \dots, x_n)/(1-x_2)] + \dots \\ & + (1-x_n)[(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, 0)/(1-x_n)] \big\}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Notice that the vectors in square brackets are all properly normalized, and that the coefficients multiplying them, that is, $(1-x_1)/(n-1), \dots, (1-x_n)/(n-1)$, add up to one. We have thus written the vector x as an average of other legitimate probability vectors. From the convexity of f , it follows then that

$$\begin{aligned} f(x) \leq \frac{1}{n-1} \big\{ & (1-x_1)f[(0, x_2, \dots, x_n)/(1-x_1)] \\ & + (1-x_2)f[(x_1, 0, x_3, \dots, x_n)/(1-x_2)] + \dots \\ & + (1-x_n)f[(x_1, \dots, x_{n-1}, 0)/(1-x_n)] \big\}. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Moreover, if any two of the λ_i 's are nonzero, and if the corresponding components x_i are also nonzero (we are about to integrate over all x , so that this latter condition is almost always met), then for at least one pair of the normalized vectors appearing in Eq. (26), the line connecting them is a line

along which f is *strictly* convex. Thus in this case the inequality in Eq. (27) is strict.

We now integrate both sides of the inequality (27) over the whole probability simplex, again using our normalized measure. To see what this integration does to the right-hand side, let us consider for now just the first term,

$$\frac{1}{n-1} \int (1-x_1) f[(0, x_2, \dots, x_n)/(1-x_1)] dx. \quad (28)$$

We perform the integral by first integrating over each surface that has a fixed value of x_1 , and then integrating over x_1 . The expression in Eq. (28) becomes

$$\left(\frac{1}{n-1}\right) \frac{\int_0^1 (1-x_1)(1-x_1)^{n-2} dx_1}{\int_0^1 (1-x_1)^{n-2} dx_1} \int_{2,\dots,n} f(x) dx. \quad (29)$$

Here the factor of $(1-x_1)^{n-2}$ comes from the fact that the area of the surface defined by a fixed value of x_1 is proportional to $(1-x_1)^{n-2}$. The denominator provides the proper normalization. Evaluating the integrals over x_1 brings the expression in Eq. (29) to

$$(1/n) \int_{2,\dots,n} f(x) dx. \quad (30)$$

We can treat the other terms on the right-hand side of Eq. (27) in the same way, so that upon integration, this inequality becomes

$$\int f(x) dx \leq (1/n) \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_{n-1}} \int_{k_1, \dots, k_{n-1}} f(x) dx. \quad (31)$$

Multiplying both sides by n and using Eq. (21), we have

$$R_n^{(n)} \leq R_{n-1}^{(n)}, \quad (32)$$

with equality holding only if just one of the λ 's is nonzero, that is, if ρ is pure.

The other inequalities in Eq. (22) can be obtained by a similar argument. Consider any face of the probability simplex in which only r of the components x_i are non-zero. Each point x on such a face can be decomposed

as in Eq. (26), and the above argument gives us an inequality analogous to Eq. (31):

$$\int_{k_1, \dots, k_r} f(x) dx \leq \frac{1}{r} \left[\int_{k_2, \dots, k_r} f(x) dx + \int_{k_1, k_3, \dots, k_r} f(x) dx + \dots + \int_{k_1, \dots, k_{r-1}} f(x) dx \right]. \quad (33)$$

We now insert this inequality into the expression (21) for $R_r^{(n)}$:

$$\begin{aligned} R_r^{(n)} &= \binom{n}{r}^{-1} n \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_r} \int_{k_1, \dots, k_r} f(x) dx \\ &\leq \binom{n}{r}^{-1} n \left(\frac{n - (r - 1)}{r} \right) \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_{r-1}} \int_{k_1, \dots, k_{r-1}} f(x) dx. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Here the factor of $n - (r - 1)$ comes from the following fact: given any set A of $r - 1$ distinct index-values [which defines the range of one of the integrals on the right-hand side of Eq. (34)], there are $n - (r - 1)$ sets of r distinct index-values from which A could have been obtained by the deletion of one value, so that each integral associated with the set A appears $n - (r - 1)$ times. Simplifying the factors in Eq. (34), we get

$$R_r^{(n)} \leq \binom{n}{r-1}^{-1} n \sum_{k_1 < \dots < k_{r-1}} \int_{k_1, \dots, k_{r-1}} f(x) dx = R_{r-1}^{(n)}. \quad (35)$$

Moreover, by an argument similar to what we used before, equality holds only if ρ is pure. This completes our proof of the string of inequalities (22).

5 Other properties of $R_r^{(n)}$

In this section we demonstrate various other properties of $R_r^{(n)}$. In particular: (i) we show that as a function of $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$, $R_r^{(n)}$ is concave; (ii) we find the maximum value of $R_r^{(n)}$; (iii) we determine how $R_r^{(n)}$ is affected by the addition of extra dimensions with zero eigenvalues.

(i) $R_r^{(n)}$ is concave. We showed earlier that the quantity f of Eq. (14), regarded as a function of x , is convex. It is easier to see that as a function of $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ (with $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$), f is concave: the function $-y \ln y$ is concave in y , and apart from a linear term, our function f is of this form,

with y being a linear function of the λ 's. According to Eq. (21), $R_r^{(n)}$ is a sum of these concave functions and is therefore concave itself.

(ii) *Maximum value of $R_r^{(n)}$.* Because $R_r^{(n)}$ is concave and is symmetric under interchange of the λ_i 's, it must achieve its maximum value when all the λ_i 's are equal, in which case they are all equal to $1/n$. It is probably easiest to obtain this maximum value explicitly via Eq. (21). Upon doing the integral, one finds that for $r = 2, \dots, n$,

$$\text{maximum of } R_r^{(n)} = \ln n - \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} + \dots + \frac{1}{r} \right). \quad (36)$$

(iii) *Adding null dimensions.* For many purposes, a density matrix in n dimensions can be regarded equally well as a density matrix in m dimensions with $m > n$, but with $m - n$ additional eigenvalues that are all zero. As we mentioned in the introduction, the entropy $S(\rho)$ does not change if one adds dimensions in this way (just as the Shannon entropy does not change if one imagines additional possibilities all having zero probability), and neither does the subentropy Q . It is interesting that in the case of Q this invariance follows immediately from the form of Eq. (5): supplementing ρ with extra zero eigenvalues means supplementing the matrix $(I - \rho/z)^{-1}$ with extra eigenvalues all equal to 1, and these eigenvalues do not change the determinant.

As we have said, however, our intermediate quantities $R_r^{(n)}$ for $r = 2, \dots, n - 1$ do not behave so simply upon addition of null dimensions. From Eq. (8) one can show that adding m zero eigenvalues to what was originally an $n \times n$ density matrix has the following effect on R_r :

$$R_r^{(n+m)} = \binom{n+m-1}{r-1}^{-1} \sum_{s=0}^{r-1} \binom{n-1}{r-1-s} \binom{m}{s} R_{r-s}^{(n)}. \quad (37)$$

It is worth checking that this equation is consistent with our assertion that both S and Q are invariant under the addition of zero eigenvalues. The entropy in $n + m$ dimensions is $S^{(n+m)} = R_1^{(n+m)}$. Setting $r = 1$ in the above equation gives us just one term, the one with $s = 0$, and we see that $R_1^{(n+m)} = R_1^{(n)}$. Similarly for the subentropy, $Q^{(n+m)} = R_{n+m}^{(n+m)}$: if we set $r = n + m$ in the above equation, we find again that only one term survives, the one with $s = m$, and that $R_{n+m}^{(n+m)} = R_n^{(n)}$.

6 Combinations invariant under the addition of zero eigenvalues

Invariance under the addition of null dimensions is a rather essential property of the von Neumann entropy. So if we are looking for generalizations of entropy, we might reasonably insist on this invariance. We have just seen that $R_r^{(n)}$ with $r = 2, \dots, n-1$ does not have this property, at least not in any obvious sense, but it is interesting to ask whether we can use the $R_r^{(n)}$'s to construct functions that *are* invariant in this way. In particular, for each value of n let us look at *weighted averages* of the $R_r^{(n)}$'s. That is, we ask whether one can find functions $\mathcal{R}^{(n)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n)$ of the form

$$\mathcal{R}^{(n)} = \sum_{r=1}^n b_r^{(n)} R_r^{(n)} \quad (38)$$

with $b_r^{(n)} \geq 0$ and $\sum_r b_r^{(n)} = 1$, such that

$$\mathcal{R}^{(n+1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, 0) = \mathcal{R}^{(n)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n). \quad (39)$$

We will refer to such sets of functions as “augmentation-invariant,” or for brevity, simply “invariant.”

Combining Eqs. (38) and (39), we see that the condition we want to satisfy is

$$\sum_{r=1}^{n+1} b_r^{(n+1)} R_r^{(n+1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, 0) = \sum_{r=1}^n b_r^{(n)} R_r^{(n)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n). \quad (40)$$

But according to Eq. (37) with $m = 1$,

$$R_r^{(n+1)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n, 0) = \frac{n-r+1}{n} R_r^{(n)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n) + \frac{r-1}{n} R_{r-1}^{(n)}(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n). \quad (41)$$

Inserting this last relation into Eq. (40) and equating coefficients of $R_r^{(n)}$, we get the following condition on the $b_r^{(n)}$'s:

$$(n-r+1)b_r^{(n+1)} + rb_{r+1}^{(n+1)} = nb_r^{(n)}. \quad (42)$$

If $\mathcal{R}^{(n)}$ is to be augmentation-invariant, then Eq. (42) must be satisfied for all pairs (n, r) such that $n \geq 1$ and $1 \leq r \leq n$. Let us say that a set b

of non-negative values $b_r^{(n)}$ is a solution to the invariance problem if it is normalized—that is, if $\sum_r b_r^{(n)} = 1$ for each n —and if it satisfies Eq. (42). We aim to find all such solutions. Note that the normalization condition $\sum_r b_r^{(n)} = 1$ is actually guaranteed by Eq. (42) for all values of n if it is true for any one value of n : summing Eq. (42) over r gives us $\sum_r b_r^{(n+1)} = \sum_r b_r^{(n)}$. Notice also that the set of solutions b is convex: if b and b' are solutions, then $pb + (1 - p)b'$ with $0 \leq p \leq 1$ is also a solution.

We begin by solving a slightly different problem, in which we restrict the range of n in Eq. (42) to $1 \leq n < N$ for some integer N . For this restricted problem, we note three facts: (i) The solution is completely determined by the values of $b_r^{(N)}$, $r = 1, \dots, N$; moreover *every* set of such values yields a solution. (ii) Because the set of allowed values of the ordered set $(b_1^{(N)}, \dots, b_N^{(N)})$ is compact, the set of solutions to the restricted problem is also compact. (iii) The extreme points of the convex set of solutions are generated by choosing $b_r^{(N)} = \delta_{r\hat{r}}$, with $\hat{r}$ in the range $1 \leq \hat{r} \leq N$ and δ being the Kronecker delta; that is, at the level $n = N$, we put all the weight on one value of r . Any other normalized set of $b_r^{(N)}$'s can be obtained as a weighted overage of these special cases.

Remarkably, we can write down *explicitly* the solution to Eq. (42) generated by $b_r^{(N)} = \delta_{r\hat{r}}$.

$$b_r^{(n)} = \binom{n-1}{r-1} \binom{N-n}{\hat{r}-r} \binom{N-1}{\hat{r}-1}^{-1}. \quad (43)$$

One can verify that these $b_r^{(n)}$'s satisfy Eq. (42) for $n < N$, that they are normalized, and that they take the values $\delta_{r\hat{r}}$ for $n = N$. This solution has a simple interpretation in basic probability theory: in a series of $N - 1$ tosses of a coin, $b_r^{(n)}$ given by Eq. (43) is the probability of getting exactly $r - 1$ heads in the first $n - 1$ tosses, *given* that in the full set of $N - 1$ tosses, the number of heads is exactly $\hat{r} - 1$. Again, any other solution of the restricted problem can be obtained by taking weighted averages of the solutions presented in Eq. (43).

We now return to the original problem, with no restriction on the value of n . As in the case of the restricted problem, there will be a set of extreme solutions from which all other solutions can be obtained as convex combinations. We find these extreme solutions by taking the limit of Eq. (43) as $N \rightarrow \infty$ and $\hat{r} \rightarrow \infty$ while the ratio $\hat{r}/N$ approaches some value α in the

range $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$. This limit gives us the following basic solutions to the invariance problem:

$$b_r^{(n)} = \binom{n-1}{r-1} \alpha^{r-1} (1-\alpha)^{n-r}. \quad (44)$$

Again, one can verify directly that these $b_r^{(n)}$'s satisfy Eq. (42). As in the restricted problem, this solution has a simple interpretation in terms of coin tossing: $b_r^{(n)}$ as given by Eq. (44) is the probability of getting $r-1$ heads in $n-1$ tosses if the probability of heads is α . Returning now to Eq. (38) we can identify, for each value of α , the following invariant set of functions $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(n)}$:

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(n)}(\rho) \equiv \sum_{r=1}^n \binom{n-1}{r-1} \alpha^{r-1} (1-\alpha)^{n-r} R_r^{(n)}(\rho). \quad (45)$$

That is, by taking an average over r of the functions $R_r^{(n)}$, with the weights in the average given by a binomial distribution, one obtains a function that is invariant under the addition of null dimensions. Moreover, these binomial averages are the extreme cases. One can always generate other invariant functions by taking convex combinations, but the binomial averages can be regarded as the basic solutions. To put it in other words, one can find invariant functions by weighting the $R_r^{(n)}$'s with *broader* distributions, but not with *narrower* distributions.

As α increases from 0 to 1, the peak of the binomial distribution in Eq. (45) moves toward larger values of r . Since we have already shown that $R_r^{(n)}$ decreases (or remains unchanged) as r increases, we see immediately that $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(n)}$ is likewise non-increasing with increasing α . For the extreme values $\alpha = 0$ and $\alpha = 1$, we have $\mathcal{R}_0^{(n)} = S$ and $\mathcal{R}_1^{(n)} = Q$. Thus $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(n)}$ interpolates continuously between S and Q .

Just as S and Q can be written as contour integrals, it turns out that $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(n)}$ can be written in a similar way: one can show that

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(n)}(\rho) = -\frac{1}{2\pi i \alpha} \oint (\ln z) \det \left\{ [I - (1-\alpha)\rho/z][I - \rho/z]^{-1} \right\} dz, \quad (46)$$

where the value at $\alpha = 0$ is determined by taking the limit. In this form, it is quite easy to see that $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(n)}$ is invariant under the addition of null dimensions. The eigenvalues of the matrix whose determinant we are taking in Eq. (46)

can be written as

$$\text{eigenvalues} = (1 - \alpha) + \alpha \left(\frac{z}{z - \lambda_i} \right), \quad (47)$$

where as always, the λ_i 's are the eigenvalues of ρ . If any of the λ_i 's are zero, they contribute a factor of 1 to the determinant and can thus be ignored in calculating the value of $\mathcal{R}_\alpha^{(n)}$. [The form (47) is also particularly convenient for deriving Eq. (46).] Because of the augmentation-invariance, we can drop the superscript n and refer unambiguously to $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$. We could also use the contour integral (46), which contains no explicit reference to n , as an alternative definition.

7 Discussion

We have identified and studied various functions that lie between the entropy S and the subentropy Q . Our first set of such functions $R_r^{(n)}$ emerged as a natural mathematical generalization of Eqs. (4) and (5), and also turned out to be generalizations of the alternative expression (13) for Q as an integral over the probability simplex. These functions share certain properties with entropy—they are concave, they take the value zero when all but one of the eigenvalues of ρ are zero, and they take their maximum value when all the eigenvalues are equal—but unlike entropy they do not remain unchanged when one includes additional dimensions corresponding to zero eigenvalues of ρ .

The related functions $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$ are weighted averages of the $R_r^{(n)}$'s and therefore share the properties just listed, but in addition they are invariant under the inclusion of null dimensions. Moreover they are the most basic functions having this property: other augmentation-invariant functions can be obtained as convex combinations of the $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$'s.

One consequence of this invariance is a very modest kind of additivity. Let ρ_1 be an arbitrary density matrix of some quantum system and let ρ_2 be the density matrix of a *pure* state of another system. Then for any α in the range $0 \leq \alpha \leq 1$, we can say

$$\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2) = \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho_1) + \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho_2). \quad (48)$$

This statement follows from the augmentation-invariance of $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$ along with two simple facts: (i) ρ_1 and $\rho_1 \otimes \rho_2$ have the same *nonzero* eigenvalues, and

(ii) $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho_2) = 0$. On the other hand, for *arbitrary* ρ_1 and ρ_2 , $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$ is not additive except when $\alpha = 0$, in which case $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$ is the entropy itself.

Does either $R_r^{(n)}$ or $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$ have a physical meaning? At this point we have no definite interpretation of either of these quantities, though because of its nice mathematical properties we have more hope for $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$. Here we suggest one way in which this quantity might play a role in quantum information theory.

Consider once again an ensemble $\mathcal{E} = \{(|\psi_i\rangle, p_i)\}$ of pure states of a quantum particle, and suppose that one is trying to convey classical information by sending a sequence of states chosen from this ensemble, with frequencies of occurrence asymptotically equal to the given probabilities p_i . If the receiver (Bob) is required to measure each particle individually, then the maximum amount of information that the sender (Alice) can convey per particle is the accessible information of the ensemble $\mathcal{E}$. Suppose, though, that Bob is able to measure *pairs* of particles jointly. Then Alice can hope to convey more information per particle by encoding her message in codewords consisting of pairs of the original states; that is, each codeword is of the form $|\psi_{i_1}\rangle \otimes |\psi_{i_2}\rangle$ with $|\psi_{i_1}\rangle$ and $|\psi_{i_2}\rangle$ chosen from $\mathcal{E}$. We insist that Alice respect the original probabilities of $\mathcal{E}$ in the sense that in a long message, each state $|\psi_i\rangle$ is used with a frequency approximating p_i . One finds that Alice often *can* increase the information conveyed per particle by using this strategy [10, 11, 12, 13]. Moreover, by continuing to increase the length of the codewords, assuming that Bob can make arbitrary joint measurements on a whole codeword, Alice can convey even more information. Let I_m be the amount of information one can convey per particle when the codeword length is m . The limiting value of I_m for arbitrarily long codewords is simply $S(\rho)$, where ρ is the density matrix of the ensemble $\mathcal{E}$ [11].

In the first stage of the above scenario, when Bob can measure only individual particles, we know that $Q(\rho)$ is a lower bound on the information that can be conveyed per particle. As the codeword length increases to infinity, I_m increases to $S(\rho)$. One is led to speculate that for intermediate codeword lengths, $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho)$ may play a role. For example, it is conceivable that when Alice and Bob are using codewords of length m , $\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho)$ is a lower bound on I_m , where $\alpha = e^{-c(m-1)}$ for some universal constant c . As m approaches infinity, then, the lower bound would approach $\mathcal{R}_0(\rho) = S(\rho)$, as it should.

We can extend this idea to the study of the classical capacity of a quantum channel. At present one does not have a simple way of calculating this

capacity for all channels, only because it is not known whether the amount of information conveyed can be increased by using inputs that are entangled between different uses of the channel [14]. If we disallow entangled inputs, then the resulting capacity—called the Holevo capacity—is given by a simple expression [1, 2]: it is the maximum, over all input ensembles, of the quantity $S(\rho) - \sum_i p_i S(\rho_i)$. Here $\{(\rho_i, p_i)\}$ is the output ensemble, and ρ is its average density matrix $\sum_i p_i \rho_i$. As in the preceding paragraph, achieving this capacity requires that Bob be able to make joint measurements on arbitrarily long blocks. But suppose that Bob cannot make such measurements; suppose that he can measure only blocks of size m . For the case $m = 1$, it is known that the information I_1 that he can gain per particle is bounded below by $\max[Q(\rho) - \sum_i p_i Q(\rho_i)]$, the maximum being over all input ensembles [9]. Just as in the preceding paragraph, we can speculate that for arbitrary m , the information I_m that one can convey per use of the channel is bounded below by $\max[\mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho) - \sum_i p_i \mathcal{R}_\alpha(\rho_i)]$, with α given by $\alpha = e^{-c(m-1)}$. Of course this statement is quite speculative and we would not even want to claim it as a conjecture. We present it only to suggest how the quantity $\mathcal{R}_\alpha$ might conceivably be applied.

What we do have at present are a set of functions that share some mathematical properties with entropy and subentropy. There is a certain elegance in the mathematics, but whether this elegance translates into value for physics remains to be seen.

References

- [1] B. Schumacher and M. D. Westmoreland, Phys. Rev. A **56**, 131 (1997).
- [2] A. S. Holevo, IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory **44**, 269 (1998).
- [3] B. Schumacher, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 2738 (1995).
- [4] R. Jozsa and B. Schumacher, J. Mod. Opt. **41**, 2343 (1994).
- [5] A. S. Holevo, *Proceedings of the Second Japan-USSR Symposium on Probability Theory*, Gisiro Maruyama and Jurii V. Prokhorov, eds. (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1973), pp. 104-119.
- [6] C. A. Fuchs and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 3047 (1994).
- [7] H. P. Huen and M. Ozawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 363 (1993).
- [8] B. W. Schumacher, M. Westmoreland, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3453 (1996).
- [9] R. Jozsa, D. Robb, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **49**, 668 (1994).
- [10] A. Peres and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 1119 (1991).
- [11] P. Hausladen, R. Jozsa, B. Schumacher, M. Westmoreland, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **54**, 1869 (1996).
- [12] M. Sasaki, K. Kato, M. Izutsu, and O. Hirota, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 146 (1998).
- [13] J. R. Buck, S. J. van Enk, and C. A. Fuchs, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 032309 (2000).
- [14] See, for example, P. W. Shor, quant-ph/0201149 and references cited therein.